

Two-player preplay negotiation games with conditional offers

Valentin Goranko¹ and Paolo Turrini²

¹Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark

²Department of Computing, Imperial College London

April 9, 2013

Abstract

We consider an extension of strategic normal form games with a phase before the actual play of the game, where players can make binding offers for transfer of utilities to other players after the play of the game, contingent on the recipient playing the strategy indicated in the offer. Such offers transform the payoff matrix of the original game but preserve its non-cooperative nature. The type of offers we focus on here are conditional on a suggested *matching offer* of the same kind made in return by the receiver. Players can exchange a series of such offers, thus engaging in a bargaining process before a strategic normal form game is played. In this paper we study and analyze solution concepts for two-player normal form games with such preplay negotiation phase, under several assumptions for the bargaining power of the players, such as the possibility of withdrawing previously made offers and opting out from the negotiation process, as well as the value of time for the players in such negotiations. We obtain results describing the possible solutions of such bargaining games and analyze the degrees of efficiency and fairness that can be achieved in such negotiation process.

1 Introduction

It is well known that many solution concepts in non-cooperative games can induce outcomes that are far from being Pareto optimal. Various studies have considered different forms of preplay interaction between the players, aiming at improving the resulting payoffs [OR94]. Such interaction range from cheap talk to signing contracts. Cheap talk affects neither the payoffs nor the non-cooperative rational behavior of the players, whereas by signing contracts the players pre-determine the outcome of the resulting normal form game, essentially playing as a coalition. In [GT] we have proposed and studied an alternative version of preplay interaction, whereby before the actual game is played any player, say A (Ann), can make a binding offer to any other player, say B (Bob), to pay him, after the game is played, an explicitly declared amount of utility δ if B plays a strategy s specified in the offer by A . Such an offer effects a simple transformation of the payoff matrix of the game, by transferring the declared amount from the payoff of A to the payoff of B in every outcome corresponding to B playing δ . Players can exchange multiple such offers in attempt to transform the game into one where their expected payoffs would be better than those expected from the original game, assuming rational behaviour of the other players according to a commonly adopted solution concept. Furthermore, players can make such offers conditional on receiving desired

matching offers, and can also possibly withdraw earlier made offers. Thus, a whole preplay negotiation phase emerges and it can be regarded as another game, played before the original normal form game is actually played, in which players bargain towards a mutually optimal transformation of the latter.

In [GT] we have introduced the conceptual framework of preplay negotiations in non-cooperative games and have presented some results, with brief and informal proofs sketches, about what players can achieve in such preplay negotiation games. In this paper we present the preplay negotiations framework for two-player normal form games with conditional offers in technical detail, expand the analysis with more results and provide detailed proofs of our main results.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the preliminary game-theoretical notions. In Section 3 we discuss conditional offers in two-player normal form games, while in Section 4 we define the whole framework of preplay negotiation games. Then, in Section 5, we analyze solution concepts for two-player preplay negotiations games under several assumptions regarding the possibility of withdrawals of offers and the value of time, and obtain results for the efficiency of such negotiations. Several previous studies have considered similar or related frameworks, incl. (chronologically) [Ros75, Gut78, Kal81, Gut87, DS91, Var94b, Var94a, aMT06] and most notably the more recent [JW05, EP11]. We discuss them in Section 6, underlying the main differences with our approach.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\{A, B\}, \{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B\}, u)$ be a two player normal form game (henceforth NFG), where $\{A, B\}$ is a set of players, $\{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B\}$ a set of finitely many strategies for each player and $u : \{A, B\} \times \Sigma_A \times \Sigma_B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a **payoff function** assigning to each player a utility for each strategy profile. The game is played by each player i choosing a strategy from Σ_i . The resulting strategy profile σ is the **outcome** of the play and $u_i(\sigma) = u(i, \sigma)$ is the associated payoff for i . An outcome of a play of the game $\mathcal{G}$ is called **maximal** if it is a Pareto optimal outcome with the highest sum of the payoffs of all players. Let $\mathbf{G}_N$ be the set of all normal form games for a set of players N . By **solution concept for $\mathbf{G}_N$** we mean a map $\mathfrak{S}$ that associates with each $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{G}_N$ a non-empty set $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ of outcomes of $\mathcal{G}$, called the **$\mathfrak{S}$ -solution of the game**. For a player i , we denote $\mathfrak{S}_i$ the restriction of the mapping $\mathfrak{S}$ to i returning only the strategies of player i consistent with $\mathfrak{S}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{S}_i(\mathcal{G}) = \{\sigma_i \in \Sigma_i \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})\}$. We also use $-i$ for any $i \in \{A, B\}$ to denote i 's opponent. In this work we do not commit to a specific solution concept for the normal form games but we assume that the one adopted by the players satisfies the necessary condition that *every outcome in any solution prescribed by that solution concept must survive iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies*. We call such solution concepts **acceptable**.

Games for which the solution concept $\mathfrak{S}$ yields a set of payoff equivalent outcomes will be called **uniformly $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable**. Games for which $\mathfrak{S}$ yields only maximal outcomes will be called **optimally $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable**. Games that are both **optimally $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable** and **uniformly $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable** will be called **perfectly $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable**. $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable games for which the solution concept $\mathfrak{S}$ yields a single outcome will be called **$\mathfrak{S}$ -solved**. For instance, every game with a strongly dominating strategy profile is $\mathfrak{S}$ -solved for any acceptable solution concept $\mathfrak{S}$. Ideally, preplay negotiation games should transform the starting NFG into a perfectly $\mathfrak{S}$ -solved, or at least perfectly $\mathfrak{S}$ -solvable, one.

It is necessary for the preplay negotiation phase for each player to have an **expected value** of any NFG that can be played. For sake of definiteness we adopt here a conservative, risk-averse approach and will define for every acceptable solution concept $\mathfrak{S}$, game $\mathcal{G}$ and a player i , the expected value of $\mathcal{G}$ for i relative to the solution concept $\mathfrak{S}$ to be:

$$v_i^{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{G}) = \max_{\sigma_i \in \mathfrak{S}_i(\mathcal{G})} \min_{\sigma_{-i} \in \mathfrak{S}_{-i}(\mathcal{G})} u_i(\sigma)$$

3 Two-player normal form games with preplay offers

Following [GT] we use the notation $A \xrightarrow{\delta/\sigma_B} B$ to denote an offer made by player A to pay an amount δ to player B after the play of the game if player B plays strategy σ_B . Any preplay offer by A to B is assumed *binding for A*, upon B playing the specified strategy. However, such offer *does not* create any obligation for B , who is still at liberty to choose his strategy when the game is actually played. In particular, after her offer A does not know before the game is played whether B will play the desired by A strategy σ_B , and thus make use of the offer or not. The key observation applying here is that *after any preplay offer the game remains a non-cooperative normal form game, only the payoff matrix changes according to the offer*. We now illustrate preplay offers in several well-known scenarios, arguing for the need of extending them to what we call *conditional offers*.

Prisoners' Dilemma. Consider a version of the Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) game in Figure 3. The only Nash Equilibrium (NE) of the game is (D, D) , yielding a payoff of $(1, 1)$. Now,

	C	D
C	3, 3	0, 4
D	4, 0	1, 1

suppose player *Row* makes to the player *Column* the offer $Row \xrightarrow{2/C} Column$. That offer transforms the game by transferring 2 utils from the payoff of *Row* to the payoff of *Column* in every entry of the column where *Column* plays C , as in Figure 1.

	C	D
C	1, 5	0, 4
D	2, 2	1, 1

Figure 1: An offer to cooperate by player Row.

In this game player *Row* still has the incentive to play D , which strictly dominates C for him, but the dominant strategy for *Column* now is C , and thus the only Nash equilibrium is (D, C) with payoff $(2, 2)$ – strictly dominating the original payoff $(1, 1)$.

Of course, *Column* can now realize that if player *Row* is to cooperate, an extra incentive is needed. That incentive *can be created* by an offer $Column \xrightarrow{2/C} Row$, that is, if *Column*, too, makes an offer to *Row* to pay him 2 utils after the game, in the event that player *Row* cooperates. Then the game transforms, as in Figure 2.

In this game, the only Nash equilibrium is (C, C) with payoff $(3, 3)$, which is also Pareto optimal. Note that this is the same payoff for (C, C) as in the original PD game, but now

	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
<i>C</i>	3, 3	2, 2
<i>D</i>	2, 2	1, 1

Figure 2: A second offer, by player Column.

both players have created incentives for their opponent to cooperate, and have thus escaped from the trap of the original Nash equilibrium (D, D) .

Remark 1 *Clearly, preplay offers can only work in case when at least part of the received payoff can actually be transferred from a player to another. They obviously cannot apply to scenarios such as the original PD, where one prisoner cannot offer to the other to stay in prison for him, even if they could communicate before the play.*

Battle of the Sexes. Consider now a typical instance of the Battle of the Sexes (Figure 3), where we call the column player *Him* and the row player *Her*. The game has two Nash equilibria: one preferred by *Her*: $(Ballet, Ballet)$, and the other – by *Him*: $(Soccer, Soccer)$.

Her/Him	<i>Ballet</i>	<i>Soccer</i>
<i>Ballet</i>	5, 3	1, 1
<i>Soccer</i>	0, 0	3, 5

Figure 3: The Battle of the Sexes.

An offer $Him \xrightarrow{2/Soccer} Her$ would transform the game to one in Figure 4. By doing so, *Him* makes the equilibrium $(Soccer, Soccer)$ equally beneficial for *Her* as $(Ballet, Ballet)$ and also sends the clear message that he intends to play *Soccer*, thus essentially breaking the coordination problem and deciding the game. However, this offer comes at a cost for *Him* and puts him in a relatively disadvantaged position.

	<i>Ballet</i>	<i>Soccer</i>
<i>Ballet</i>	5, 3	1, 1
<i>Soccer</i>	2, -2	5, 3

Figure 4: The Battle of the Sexes, transformed by an offer by *Him* favouring *Her*.

The need for conditional offers. The loss and disadvantage incurred by *Him* in the BoS — but similar considerations can be made for the the PD — can be partly neutralized by a matching offer $Her \xrightarrow{1/Soccer} Him$, which transforms the game to the one in Figure 5.

But, of course, *Her* has no incentive to make such an offer to *Him* in the game on Figure 4. So, the only realistic way for *Him* to force such matching offer by *Her* is to make his offer $Him \xrightarrow{2/Soccer} Her$ conditional on *Her* making to *Him* the matching offer $Her \xrightarrow{1/Soccer} Him$. This conditional offer is denoted hereafter as $Him \xrightarrow{2/Soccer \mid 1/Ballet} Her$. The effect is that players reach an equitable redistribution of the payoffs in the expected (maxmin) outcome.

	<i>Ballet</i>	<i>Soccer</i>
<i>Ballet</i>	5, 3	0, 2
<i>Soccer</i>	2, -2	4, 4

Figure 5: The Battle of the Sexes, further transformed by a matching offer.

Thus, the idea of conditional offers is, that such an offer — unlike the previously considered unconditional offers — is only confirmed and enforced if the receiver of such offer does make the required counter-offer, else it is automatically cancelled and nullified.

In practice, a conditional offer $A \xrightarrow{\alpha/\sigma_B \mid \beta/\rho_A} B$ enables the offering player to *suggest* a transformation of the game $\mathcal{G}$ into a game $\mathcal{G}(A \xrightarrow{\alpha/\sigma_B \mid \beta/\rho_A} B)$ that is updated according to the offer. Here is the formal definition.

Definition 2 (Suggested transformation) *Let $\mathcal{G} = (\{A, B\}, \{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B\}, u)$ be a NFG, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be nonnegative amounts of payoff, σ, ρ, τ be strategy profiles. A suggested transformation by player A with $A \xrightarrow{\alpha/\sigma_B \mid \beta/\rho_A} B$ is the game $\mathcal{G}(A \xrightarrow{\alpha/\sigma_B \mid \beta/\rho_A} B) = (\{A, B\}, \{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B\}, u')$ where:*

$$u'_A(\tau) = \begin{cases} u_A(\tau) & \text{if } \tau_B \neq \sigma_B \text{ and } \tau_A \neq \rho_A \\ u_A(\tau) - \alpha & \text{if } \tau_B = \sigma_B \text{ and } \tau_A \neq \rho_A \\ u_A(\tau) + \beta & \text{if } \tau_B \neq \sigma_B \text{ and } \tau_A = \rho_A \\ u_A(\tau) + \beta - \alpha & \text{if } \tau_B = \sigma_B \text{ and } \tau_A = \rho_A \end{cases}$$

$$u'_B(\tau) = u_B(\tau) + u_A(\tau) - u'_A(\tau)$$

In words, a suggested transformation updates the original game into a new game where only the payoff vectors change, according to the conditional offer that is made. At each profile, each player collects the positive reward received in the part of the conditional offer consistent with the profile, subtracting in the same fashion the payments given.

Acceptance and rejection. There are two responses to a conditional offer $A \xrightarrow{\alpha/\sigma_B \mid \beta/\rho_A} B$: it can be *accepted* or *rejected* by the receiving player. If rejected, the offer is immediately cancelled and does not commit any of the players to any payment, and therefore it does not induce any transformation of the game matrix. If accepted, the *actual transformation* induced by the offer is the suggested transformation defined above.

Withdrawals. An additional option associated with preplay offers is that of *withdrawal* of an offer. Technically, withdrawal of a conditional offer $A \xrightarrow{\alpha/\sigma_B \mid \beta/\rho_A} B$ is effected by imposing a transformation on the game reverting the offered payment, i.e., induced by the (fictitious) negative offer $A \xrightarrow{-\alpha/\sigma_B \mid -\beta/\rho_A} B$.

Withdrawals can be seen as a sort of unconditional subtraction of payoff that has already been granted to other players in a previous offer, which has been accepted. Thereby the possibility of performing a withdrawal strictly depends on the previous history of the negotiation and this feature will be of fundamental importance when treating preplay negotiations as full-fledged extensive games.

Additional optional assumptions. In general, there are several important additional assumptions that, depending on the particular scenarios under investigation may, or may not, be realistically made. We therefore do not commit to any of them, but we acknowledge that each of them can make a significant difference in the behaviour and abilities of players to steer the game in the best possible direction for them. So, we consider the possible options for each of them separately and study the consequences under the various combinations of assumptions. Examples are:

- the revocability of offers, i.e., whether or not offers may be withdrawn during the negotiations phase;
- the value of time, i.e., whether and how much players strictly prefer a reward in the present to the same reward in the future;
- the order of making offers, i.e., the behaviour of the protocol determining the player(s) to move;
- the conditionality of offers, i.e., whether or not we allow conditional offers.

4 Preplay negotiation games

Similarly to [JW05], our setting for normal form games with preplay offers begins with a given *starting* normal form game $\mathcal{G}$ and consists of two phases:

- A *preplay negotiation phase*, where players negotiate on how to transform the game $\mathcal{G}$ by making offers, accepting or rejecting conditional offers they receive, and possibly withdrawing old ones.
- An *actual play* phase where, after having agreed on some transformation X in the previous phase, the players play the game $\mathcal{G}(X)$.

4.1 Preplay negotiation games

We call the resulting games *preplay negotiation games* (hereafter abbreviated PNG). We define them formally as a special kind of extensive form games. Before that we need to introduce some concepts associated with them.

Pending offers. In a PNG players have a variety of moves at their disposal, depending on the circumstances. In particular the moves available to the player whose turn is to play depend on whether or not he/she has received any conditional offers since his/her previous move. If so, we say that the player has **pending (conditional) offers**.

Histories. A **history** in a PNG is a finite or infinite sequence of admissible moves by the players who take their turns according to a protocol satisfying certain conditions (see Definition 3) and can have the following form:

- a) $(h, \mathbf{g}(h)(X_{turn(h)}))$, where the player to move at history h — denoted $turn(h)$ — has proposed the transformation $X_{turn(h)}$ of the game associated with it — denoted $\mathbf{g}(h)(X_{turn(h)})$ (the precise meaning of the notation is given in Definition 3).
- b) (h, A) , where the player to move at history h has accepted the pending conditional offer.

- c) (h, R) , where the player to move at history h has rejected the pending conditional offer.
- d) (h, P) , where the player to move at history h has passed.
- e) h , with $|h| = \infty$, an infinite *disagreement* history where players have found no agreement.
- f*) (h, W^t) , where the player to move at history h has withdrawn the t -th made (by him) offer. This type of histories will only be considered optionally.
- g*) (h, O) , where the player to move at history h opts out of the negotiation. This type of histories will only be considered optionally.

Termination. The PNG may terminate if all players pass at some stage – in which case we say that the players *have reached agreement* – or may go on forever, in which case the players have failed to reach agreement; we call such situation a (*passive*) *disagreement* and we denote any such infinite history with D . Disagreements and their consequences will be described in Definition 3 and we will assume that *no disagreement is better for any player than any agreement*.

Set of actions. Thus, the set of actions in a PNG is:

$$\{A, P, R, O, W^t, \mathbf{g}(h)(X_{\text{turn}(h)})\},$$

with the intended meaning specified above.

Current NFG. Every finite history in a PNG is associated with the current NFG: the result of the transformation of the starting game by all offers that are so far made, accepted and currently not withdrawn. The current NFG of the empty history is the starting NFG of the PNG.

Opting out. We also consider a more flexible and often more realistic alternative, whereby all players provisionally accept the starting NFG and can explicitly express tentative acceptance of the current NFG, on which they are currently negotiating by making offers, or can terminate the negotiations by explicitly *opting out*, which would revert to the last, currently accepted by everyone NFG.

Plays and outcomes. A PNG starts with an input NFG $\mathcal{G}$ and either ends with a transformed game $\mathcal{G}'$ or goes on forever. A **play** of a PNG is any finite history at the end of which the preplay negotiations game is over, or any infinite history, in case of disagreement. The **outcome of a play of the PNG** is the resulting transformed game $\mathcal{G}'$ in the former case and 'Disagreement' (briefly D) in the latter case.

A PNG can now be formally defined as follows:

Definition 3 (Preplay negotiation game) A preplay negotiation game (PNG) is a tuple

$$\mathcal{E} = (\{A, B\}, H, \text{turn}, \{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B\}, o, \mathcal{G}, \mathfrak{S}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{u})$$

where:

- $\{A, B\}$ is the set of players;
- H is a non-empty set of finite or infinite sequences, called histories, comprising the empty sequence, which are prefix closed and limit closed. A history $h \in H$ is called terminal if it is infinite or there is no history in H extending it. The set of terminal histories is denoted Z . Every element of a history is called an action. The set of all actions is denoted A .

- $\text{turn} : H \setminus Z \rightarrow N$ is a turn function, assigning players to non-terminal histories, with the idea that player i moves at history h whenever $\text{turn}(h) = i$;
- Σ_i , for $i \in N$, is a non-empty set of strategies $\sigma_i : \{h \in H \setminus Z \mid \text{turn}(h) = i\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ for each player i that assign an action to any non-terminal history whose turn to play is i 's; we refer to $\sigma_{\text{turn}(h)}(h)$ as the action prescribed by strategy σ at history h for the player who moves at h ;
- $o : \prod_{i \in N} \Sigma_i \rightarrow Z$ is an outcome function from the set of strategy profiles to the set of terminal histories.
- $\mathcal{G}$ is the starting normal form game. We require that its set of players is $\{A, B\}$.
- $\mathfrak{S}$ is an acceptable solution concept.
- $\mathbf{g} : H \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_N$ is a function associating to each history the currently accepted NFG, with the intended meaning that $\mathbf{g}(h)$ would be the outcome of the PNG if the game ended at h . We require that: if $h = \emptyset$, then $\mathbf{g}(h) = \mathcal{G}$; if $h = (h', a)$ and $a \neq A$ then $\mathbf{g}(h) = \mathbf{g}(h')$; if $a = A$ then $\mathbf{g}(h)$ is updated accordingly (see Definition 3).
- $\mathbf{u} : \{A, B\} \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the utility function of the PNG, associating to each player and terminal history a payoff. The function is such that for each $i \in N, z \in Z$, $\mathbf{u}(i, z) = \mathbf{v}^{\mathfrak{S}}_i(\mathbf{g}(z))$. The expression $\mathbf{u}(i, z)$ will be abbreviated $\mathbf{u}_i(z)$. Moreover for $z, z' \in Z$, with z finite and z' infinite, we require that $\mathbf{u}_i(z) \geq \mathbf{u}_i(z')$ for all players, and $\mathbf{u}_i(z) > \mathbf{u}_i(z')$ for some i.e., no disagreement is better for any player than any agreement.

The following conditions are imposed on every history $h \in H$ in a PNG:

- if h is of type a), i.e., of the form $(h', \mathbf{g}(h')(X_{\text{turn}(h')}))$ then $\text{turn}(h) = -\text{turn}(h')$, i.e. after an offer is made the opponent is to move, and $(h, h^*) \in H$ iff h^* starts with A or with R , i.e. $s(\text{he})$ can only accept or reject the proposed transformation.
- if h is of type b), i.e., it is of the form (h', A) , then $\mathbf{g}(h) = \mathbf{g}(h')(X_{\text{turn}(h')})$, where $X_{\text{turn}(h')}$ is the last suggested transformation. In other words, if a player accepts an offer, the current game becomes the one associated with the previous history updated with the accepted offer.
- if h is of type c), i.e., it is of the form (h', R) , then $\mathbf{g}(h) = \mathbf{g}(h')$. In other words, rejecting an offer means leaving the game as it was before.
- if h is of type d), i.e., it is of the form (h', P) , then $\mathbf{g}(h) = \mathbf{g}(h')$. Moreover if it is of the form (h', P, P) then $h \in Z$, i.e., with everybody passing the game has ended.
- if h is of type g), i.e., it is of the form (h', W^t) , and $\mathbf{g}(h') = \mathcal{G}(X_{\text{turn}(h')})$, then $\mathbf{g}(h) = \mathcal{G}$, i.e., $\mathbf{g}(h')$ is the withdrawal from the current game of the t -th proposal made in the game and so far not withdrawn. We require moreover that the proposal was indeed made by player $\text{turn}(h')$.

Solution of a PNG. By a solution of a PNG we mean the set of all transformed normal form games that can be obtained as outcomes of plays induced by subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profiles in the PNG. The notions of subgame and subgame perfect equilibrium for the case of PNG are defined in the expected way (for a reference see [OR94]).

4.2 Feasible moves and efficient negotiations

In order to understand how solutions of PNG look and to make statements about existence of *good solutions*, we need to discuss the notions of feasibility of moves and *efficiency of negotiation strategies*. In this context we will use the term *efficient* not in its standard game-theoretic sense, referring to outcomes, but to the way outcomes are reached.

Feasible offers and moves. A player's offer is **weakly feasible** if it does not decrease that player's expected value of the game in the transformed by that offer game; the offer is **feasible** if it strictly increases that expected value. This is a generic notion of feasibility of offers, which needs to be extended further to the notion of feasible moves in the PNG. The latter is specific to some of the optional additional assumptions which we will discuss in more detail for the two-player case in the next section.

Minimal offers. Clearly, an optimal offer from a player to another should be a *minimal feasible one* providing a sufficient incentive for the recipient of the offer to play the desired transformation, but not more than that.

It is often the case that no minimal offer exists that achieves the objective, e.g., to turn the desired strategy into a *strictly* dominant one. For instance, if it suffices for A to pay to B any amount that is *greater than* d for that purpose, then any offer of $d + \epsilon$, for $\epsilon > 0$, should do. Clearly, however, there is a practical minimum beyond which a player in question would not bother optimizing any further, so we will often refer to offers of payments d^+ meaning $d + \epsilon$ for 'sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ ' without specifying the value of ϵ , but still allowing its further reduction, as long as it remains strictly positive.

Efficient negotiation strategies.

Definition 4 (Efficient negotiation strategies) *A strategy in the preplay negotiation game is an efficient negotiation strategy if it only involves making (minimal) feasible offers, it passes once they are accepted, and – in the case when conditional offers are allowed – at no point prescribes withdrawal of earlier made offers. It is strongly efficient if the vector of payoffs of the outcome it attains is a redistribution of the vector of payoffs of a maximal outcome.*

A number of important relevant questions arise:

- Is it the case that every subgame perfect equilibrium strategy of a PNG is an efficient negotiation strategy?
- If not, can the inefficient ones be replaced by efficient ones generating the same, or at least as good solution? Does this depend on the number of players?
- Under what conditions can a given (maximal) Pareto optimal outcome in the starting NFG become the unique outcome of the final NFG?

To answer these questions we need an analysis of the solutions of the PNG game. The next section will provide such analysis for the case of two players.

5 Two-players normal form games with preplay negotiations

Before analyzing some of the more interesting optional assumptions, let us state a useful general result, also valid in the case of many players PNG. An extensive form game is said

to have the **One Deviation Property** (ODP) [OR94, Lemma 98.2] if, in order to check that a strategy profile is a Nash equilibrium in (some subgame of) that game, it suffices to consider the possible profitable deviations of each player not amongst *all* of its strategies (in that subgame), but only amongst the ones differing from the considered profile in the first subsequent move (in that subgame).

Lemma 5 *Every PNG has the One Deviation Property.*

Proof.

Let $\mathcal{E} = (\{A, B\}, H, \text{turn}, \{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B\}, o, \mathcal{G}, \mathfrak{S}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{u})$ be a PNG, and $H_f \subseteq H$ the set of finite histories in H . Let moreover $\mathcal{E}_f$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to H_f , where the individual components are defined in the expected way. But $\mathcal{E}_f$ is a game of finite horizon, and by [OR94, Lemma 98.2] it has the One Deviation Property. But by the fact that no disagreement is better for any player than any agreement, (Definition 3) then also $\mathcal{E}$ has that property. ■

Furthermore, to analyze equilibrium strategies of PNG we consider so called **stationary acceptance strategies** where players have a minimal acceptance threshold d and a minimal passing threshold $d' \geq d$ (both of which may vary among the players).

5.1 Conditional offers with non-valuable time

The value for a player of a history in a PNG is the value for the player of the current NFG associated with that history. When time is not valuable players assign the same value to the NFG associated with the current moment and the same game associated with any other moment in the future, which means that players can afford delaying or withdrawing offers at no extra cost.

Proposition 6 *Every subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profile of a two-player PNG with non-valuable time consisting of stationary acceptance strategies is strongly efficient.*

Proof. Suppose not. Let d^- be a vector of expected values that is not the redistribution of a maximal outcome of the starting game associated to some subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profile. We know that such strategy profile yields a history h that ends with: 1) the proposal of d^- ; 2) the acceptance of that proposal; 3) a pass; 4) a pass. Consider now some redistribution d^* of a maximal outcome where both players get more than in d^- and the history h where the last four steps are substituted by the following ones: 1) the proposal of d^* ; 2) the acceptance of that proposal; 3) pass; 4) pass. By stationarity of strategies and the ODP, the player moving at step 1) is better off deviating from d^- and instead proposing d^* : a contradiction. ■

The condition of stationarity of acceptance strategies is needed if we want to prevent SPE that lead to inefficiency. Indeed, if players were not adhering to stationary acceptance strategies there could be a *suboptimal* outcome, guaranteeing for both players expected values respectively of d_A and d_B . To enforce that outcome it then suffices to design a strategy profile whereby off the equilibrium path player A threatens player B with a *stubborn* but maximal stationary acceptance strategy giving him less than d_B , while player B threatens A with an expected payoff of strictly less than d_A . So, if players are not obliged to be consistent in their acceptance policies, d_A and d_B can be the result of a subgame perfect equilibrium strategy.

The example below provides a detailed instance of such games.

Example 7 (Attaining inefficiency) *In what follows we say that a player ‘proposes a given outcome with a given payoff distribution’ to mean that the player makes a conditional offer which, when accepted, would make that specific outcome, with that specific distribution of the payoffs, the unique (dominant strategy equilibrium) outcome in the solution of the transformed game. More generally, we say that a player “proposes a payoff distribution” to mean that the player makes a conditional offer which, when accepted, would make that specific payoff distribution the vector of expected utilities of the players.*

Consider the following starting NFG (Figure 6). As there are no dominant strategy equilibria, there are acceptable solution concepts assigning 2 to each player.

	L	R
U	2, 2	4, 3
D	3, 3	2, 2

Figure 6: Attaining inefficient divisions

We now construct a strategy profile of the PNG starting from that game, such that: (i) it is a SPE strategy profile and (ii) it attains an inefficient outcome.

1. *At the root node player A proposes outcome (D, L) with payoff distribution (3, 3).*
2. *After such proposal player B accepts. However, if A had made a different offer (so, off the equilibrium path) B would reject and keep proposing outcome (U, R) with distribution of 5 for him and 2 for A and accepting (and passing on) maximal outcomes guaranteeing him at least 5. A, on the other hand, would not have better option than proposing the same distribution (5 for B and 2 for her) and accepting only maximal outcomes guaranteeing her at least 2. Notice that once they enter this subgame neither A nor B can profitably deviate from such distribution.*
3. *If, however, B did not accept the (3, 3) deal then A would keep proposing outcome (U, R) with a redistribution of (5, 2) (5 for her, 2 for him) and accepting at least that much. B on the other hand would also stick to the same distribution, accepting at least 2. Again, no player can profitably deviate from this stationary strategy profile starting from B’s rejection.*
4. *After player B has accepted the deal (3, 3), then A passes. If A did not pass, player B would go back to his (2, 5) redistribution threat.*

Likewise with the next round. That eventually leads to the inefficient outcome (3, 3).

It is easy to check that the strategy profile described above is a subgame perfect equilibrium. No player can at any point deviate profitably by proposing the outcome (U, L) with dominating payoff distribution, e.g., (3.5, 3.5) .

We first focus on PNG where the opt out option is not available, and introduce it as an additional feature later on.

Negotiations without ‘opt out’ moves. In PNG with non-valuable time and without the possibility of opting out every redistribution of a maximal outcome can be attained as a solution.

Proposition 8 *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be PNG with non-valuable time starting from a NFG $\mathcal{G}$ and let $d = (x_A, x_B)$ be any redistribution of a maximal outcome of the starting NFG. The following strategy profile $\sigma = (\sigma_A, \sigma_B)$ is a subgame perfect equilibrium:*

For each player $i \in \{A, B\}$:

- if i is the first player to move, he proposes a transformation of $\mathcal{G}$ where the vector of expected values in the transformed game is d ;*
- when i can make an offer and the previously made offer has not been accepted, he proposes a transformation of the current NFG where the vector of expected values in the transformed game is d ;*
- when i can make an offer and the previously made offer has been accepted, he passes;*
- when i has a pending offer of a suggested transformation where the vector of expected values in the transformed game is d' , he accepts it if and only if $x'_i \geq x_i$, and rejects it otherwise;*
- i never withdraws any previously made offer;*
- when i can pass and the other player has just passed, he passes;*
- when i can pass and the other player has not just passed, he proposes d ;*
- when i has just accepted a proposal he passes;*

Proof. We have to show that there is no subgame where a player i can profitably deviate from this strategy at its root. By Lemma 5 we can restrict ourselves to considering only first move deviations to the above described strategy.

Suppose the player has a pending offer that induces a transformation of the current NFG where the vector of expected values is d^* . If she accepts it then the outcome will be d^* , due to the definition of the strategy profile; if she rejects it, it will be the starting offer d . And she will accept if and only if she will get more from d^* than from d . So the acceptance component is optimal. For the remaining cases, if player i deviates from the prescribed strategy, due to the construction of the strategy and Lemma 5, the vector of payoffs associated to the outcome of $\mathcal{E}$ will be d anyway. ■

As a consequence of the previous proposition we obtain:

Corollary 9 *The game associated to the outcome of a subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profile consisting of stationary acceptance strategies in a two-player PNG with non-valuable time is optimally solvable.*

In summary, our analysis of two-player PNG with non-valuable time shows that efficiency can be attained when conditional offers are allowed and stationary acceptance strategies are followed. Indeed, any redistribution of the vector of payoffs of a maximal outcome can be made the unique solution of the final NFG by such SPE strategies. However, non-stationary acceptance strategies may lead to inefficient equilibria, as Example 7 clearly shows: there exist subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profiles of a two-player PNG with conditional offers and non-valuable time where (i) offers are made that are not feasible, (ii) the vector of payoffs of the outcome it attains is not a redistribution of the vector of payoffs of a maximal outcome, i.e., it is not strongly efficient.

Negotiations with ‘opt out’ moves. To address the issues related to possible inefficiency we consider the possibility for players to make an *opt out* move and unilaterally put an end to the negotiations, by making the currently accepted NFG the outcome of the whole PNG.

Proposition 10 *Let σ be a subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profile of a PNG with opt out move and let h be the resulting history. Then σ guarantees to all players at least as much as they had in the currently accepted NFG; in particular, at least as much as in the original game.*

Proof. Starting with the original, automatically agreed upon game, each currently accepted NFG must make each player better off than in the previous one; otherwise opting out would be a profitable deviation. ■

By introducing the possibility of opting out, the set of subgame perfect equilibria reduces further. Strategies, such as the one described in Example 7 contemplating an unreasonably high or unreasonably low reward for the proponent, will not be equilibria anymore. However, this extra option does really not solve the problem of attaining inefficiency, as the comment to Proposition 6 still applies. It has, however, several advantages: first, the equilibrium strategies of the PNG will guarantee for both players at least the expected payoff of the starting NFG; and second, the threat of opting out gives the players the possibility of making a more effective use of unconditional offers.

To sum up, while SPE strategies in a two-player PNG can attain efficiency, some important issues are still remaining:

- some SPE strategies, e.g., non-stationary acceptance strategies, are not strongly efficient.
- players can keep making unfeasible moves as a part of a SPE strategy, i.e., there are forms of equilibria where some players strictly decrease their expected payoff with respect to the original game;
- even strongly efficient strategies do not always yield perfectly solved games, as there is no notion of *most fair* redistribution of the payoff vectors in the solution of the original game.

Thus, when time is of no value, even the possibility of making conditional offers is not sufficient to guarantee that fair and efficient outcomes are ever reached.

5.2 Conditional offers with valuable time

We will see here that when time is of value the problems mentioned above can be at least partially solved. To impose value on time we introduce, for each player i , a *payoff discounting factor* $\delta_i \in (0, 1)$ applied at every round of the PNG *associated to offers that are made* to his payoffs. These factors measure the players' impatience, i.e., how much they value time, and reduce the payoffs accordingly as time goes by. Thus, the players have no interest in delaying the negotiations by making redundant moves, or sub-optimal or subsequently withdrawn offers. The general intuition in this case, which we will justify further, is that for the sake of time efficiency, in a SPE strategy profile:

1. If any player is ever going to make an offer, she would never make any earlier offer that gives her, if accepted, a lesser value of the resulting game.
2. If any player is ever going to accept a given offer (or any other offer which is at least as good for her) she should do it the first time when she receives such offer.

In analyzing PNG with valuable time we consider several cases, depending on whether withdrawals and opting out are allowed.

5.2.1 No withdrawals and no opting out

For technical reasons we impose some additional constraints:

- every game associated with a history of a PNG does not have outcomes *in the solution* (but, possibly elsewhere) that assign negative utility to players. Notice, that we do allow payoff vectors consisting of negative reals to be present in the game matrix, only we do not allow such vectors to be associated to outcomes in the solution. This constraint that we impose has several practical consequences:
 - players' expected payoffs *decrease* in time, i.e., the discounting factor δ has always a negative effect on the expected payoff.
 - players can make offers that redistribute the payoff vectors associated with outcomes in the solution, leaving some nonnegative amount to each player and some strictly positive amount to some.
- the expected payoff of each player at any disagreement history can be assumed 0.

We will use the following notational conventions:

- (x, t) denotes the payoff vector x at time t , where each component x_i is discounted by δ_i^t ; $(x, t)_i$ denotes the payoff of player i in the vector x at time t .
- $\mathcal{G}_X$ will denote the set of all possible redistributions of payoffs of outcomes in a NFG $\mathcal{G}$ that assign nonnegative payoffs to all players. This set is compact, but generally not connected, as in the bargaining games of [4]. However, it is a finite union of compact and connected sets, and that will suffice to generalize the results from [4] that we need.

The following properties of every 2-person PNG with valuable time starting from a given NFG $\mathcal{G}$ are the four fundamental assumptions of Osborne and Rubinstein's bargaining model [OR94, p.122].

1. For each $x, y \in \mathcal{G}_X$ such that $x \neq y$, if $(x, 0)_i = (y, 0)_i$ then $(x, 0)_{-i} \neq (y, 0)_{-i}$. This holds because the set $\mathcal{G}_X$ is made by payoff vectors and subtracting some payoff to a player means adding it to the other.
2. $(b^i, 1)_{-i} = (b^i, 0)_{-i} = (D)_{-i}$, where b^i is the highest payoff that i obtains in $\mathcal{G}_X$ and $(D)_{-i}$ the payoff for $-i$ in any disagreement history. As b^i is the best agreement for player i it is also the worst one for player $-i$.
3. If x is Pareto optimal amongst the payoff vectors in $\mathcal{G}_X$ then, by definition of $\mathcal{G}_X$, there is no y with $(x, 0)_i \geq (y, 0)_i$ for each $i \in N$. Moreover, x is a redistribution of a maximal outcome in $\mathcal{G}$.
4. There is a unique pair (x^*, y^*) with $x^*, y^* \in \mathcal{G}_X$ such that $(x^*, 1)_A = (y^*, 0)_A$ and $(y^*, 1)_B = (x^*, 0)_B$ and both x^*, y^* are Pareto optimal amongst the payoff vectors in $\mathcal{G}_X$.

The first 3 statements above are quite straightforward. To see the last one, let $x^* = (x_A^*, x_B^*)$ and $y^* = (y_A^*, y_B^*)$ and let the sum of the payoffs in any maximal outcome in $\mathcal{G}$ be d . Then $(x_A^*, x_B^*, y_A^*, y_B^*)$ is the unique solution of the following, clearly consistent and determined system of equations:

$$y_A = \delta_A x_A, x_B = \delta_B y_B, x_A + x_B = d, y_A + y_B = d.$$

The solution (see also [OR94]) is:

$$x_A = d \frac{1 - \delta_B}{1 - \delta_A \delta_B}; y_A = \delta_A d \frac{1 - \delta_B}{1 - \delta_A \delta_B}$$

$$x_B = \delta_B d \frac{1 - \delta_A}{1 - \delta_A \delta_B}; \quad y_B = d \frac{1 - \delta_A}{1 - \delta_A \delta_B}.$$

Relation with bargaining games In the remaining part of the section we will explicitly view preplay negotiation as a bargaining process on how to play the starting normal form game. Using our observations and assumptions, we can adapt the results from [OR94] to show that when time is valuable not only all equilibria consisting of stationary acceptance strategies attain efficiency but they also do it by redistributing the payoff vector in relation to players' impatience. Stationary acceptance strategies will be needed to focus only on the maximal connected subspace of the set $\mathcal{G}_X$. To say it with a slogan, while in [OR94] efficiency and fairness can be obtained in scenarios that resemble the division of a cake, in our setting we prove similar results for a set of cakes, of possibly different size. We extend the efficiency and fairness results obtained in [OR94] for bargaining games of the type of 'division of a cake' to similar results for somewhat more general bargaining games of the type where players have to choose a cake from a set of cakes, of possibly different sizes and divide it. Our claim, in a nutshell, is that, when players employ stationary acceptance strategies, they immediately choose the largest cake and then bargain on how to divide it.

First, recall that in our framework time passes as new proposals are made. So, from a technical point if the PNG start with a game that is already perfectly solved, the player moving first will not be punished by passing immediately.

Then, without restriction of the generality of our analysis, we can assume a *unique* discounting factor for both players. Indeed, the discount factor of e.g., player A can be made equal to that of B while preserving the relative preferences of A on the set of outcomes by suitably re-scaling the payoffs of A in the input NFG, and therefore the expected value for A of that game; for technical details see [OR94, p.119] following an idea of Fishburn and Rubinstein quoted there.

Now we are ready to state the main result for this case:

Theorem 11 *Let (x^*, y^*) be the unique pair of payoff vectors defined above. Then, in a PNG with valuable time starting from a NFG $\mathcal{G}$ with a unique discounting factor δ for both players, the strategy of player A in every subgame perfect equilibrium consisting of stationary acceptance strategies satisfies the following (to obtain the strategy for B simply swap x^* and y^*):*

- *if A is the first player to move she 'proposes' outcome x^* , i.e., makes a conditional offer that, if accepted, would update the game into one with its dominant strategy equilibrium yielding the Pareto maximal outcome x^* as payoff vector;*
- *when A has a pending offer y' , she accepts it if and only if the payoff she gets in y' is at least as much as in y^* ;*
- *when A can pass, she passes if and only if the expected value associated to the proposed game y'_A is at least as much as y^*_A ; otherwise she proposes x^* .*

Proof. It is easy to check, using the ODP, that no player can improve at any history of the game by deviating from this strategy. Consider for instance the case when player A at time t can choose whether to pass or not on the proposal of a distribution z on which player B has already passed. If A passes then the payoff vector will be (z, t) , if not it will be $(x^*, t+1)$. Obviously $(z, t)_A \geq (x^*, t+1)_A$ if and only if $(z, 0)_A \geq (x^*, 1)_A = (y^*, 0)_A$, so the acceptance rule is optimal. The reasoning for the other cases is similar.

To prove the claim we use a variant of the argument given in [OR94] for bargaining games, summarized as follows. We first show [Step 1] that the best SPE payoff for player A in any subgame $\mathcal{G}'_A$ starting with her proposal and where $\mathcal{G}'$ is the currently accepted game — let us denote it by $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)$ — yields the same utility as the worst one — $m_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)$ — which, in turn, is the payoff of A at x^* . The argument for B is symmetric. Then we show [Step 2] that in every SPE the initial proposal is x^* , which is immediately accepted by the other player, followed by each player passing. Finally, we show [Step 3] that the acceptance and the passing conditions given are shared by every SPE strategy profile.

[Step 1] WLOG let A be the player moving first and call $\mathcal{G}'_A$ each subgame of the PNG beginning with a proposal by player A and where $\mathcal{G}'$ is the currently accepted NFG at its root ($\mathcal{G}_A$ is the game itself). Analogously let us call $\mathcal{G}'_B$ each subgame of the PNG beginning with a proposal by player B . For each player i let $M_i(\mathcal{G}'_i)$ be the best SPE outcome that player i can get from $\mathcal{G}'_i$, i.e., $M_i(\mathcal{G}'_i) = \sup\{\delta^t x_i \mid \text{there is a SPE of } \mathcal{G}'_i \text{ consisting of stationary acceptance strategies with value } (x, t)_i\}$. Let $m_i(\mathcal{G}'_i)$ be the corresponding infimum. Recall that b^i is the highest payoff that i obtains in $\mathcal{G}_X$. Hereafter we write b^i_j instead of $(b^i, 0)_j$ for $i, j \in N$. By our assumptions the observations above, $b^A_A = b^B_B = 0$.

We can now show that for each $\mathcal{G}'$, $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) = m_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) = x^*_A$ and $M_B(\mathcal{G}'_B) = m_B(\mathcal{G}'_B) = y^*_B$. We first show that $m_B(\mathcal{G}'_B) \geq b^B_B - \delta M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)$. Therefore, if player A rejects a proposal of player B in the first period of $\mathcal{G}'_B$ then she cannot get more than $\delta M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)$. This means that in any SPE of $\mathcal{G}'_B$ she must accept any proposal giving her more than $\delta M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)$ (otherwise she could be at least as well off by rejecting it). Thus what is left for player B is no less than $b^B_B - \delta M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)$ in any SPE of $\mathcal{G}'_B$.

It is easy to see that $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) \leq b^A_A - \delta m_B(\mathcal{G}'_B)$, because player A cannot get more than her best agreement minus what player B could guarantee with a rejection. In other words, player A needs to pay B with the difference between her ideal (appropriately discounted) payoff and what B could guarantee alone. We can show now that $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) = x^*_A$. That $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) \geq x^*_A$ is easily observed from the properties satisfied by every SPE and the fact that each $\mathcal{G}'$ is a transformation of $\mathcal{G}$ by conditional offers. To show that $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) \leq x^*_A$ we argue the following. We know that $\delta b^A_B = 0$. We also know that $\delta(b^B_B - \delta b^A_A) > 0 = b^A_A = b^B_B - b^A_A$. In turn we have that $b^A_A > b^A_A - (\delta(b^B_B - \delta b^A_A))$. By the previous observations we can conclude that $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) \leq b^A_A - (\delta(b^B_B - \delta M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A)))$. But, for a similar argument to that used in the proof of Proposition 6, M_A is obtained from a strongly efficient SPE. So, as the set of maximal outcomes in $\mathcal{G}_X$ is compact and connected, we can also conclude that there exists $U_A \in [M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A), b^A_A]$ such that $U_A = b^A_A - (\delta(b^B_B - \delta U_A))$. Now if $M_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) > x^*_A$ then $U_A \neq x^*_A$. But then taking any pair of efficient agreements (a^*, b^*) such that $a^*_A = U_A$ and $b^*_A = \delta U_A$ we have obtained a pair of efficient agreements contradicting Property 5.2.1 (4). Similar reasoning shows that $m_A(\mathcal{G}'_A) = x^*_A$, $M_B(\mathcal{G}'_B) = y^*_B$ and finally $m_B(\mathcal{G}'_B) = y^*_B$.

[Step 2] Step 1 implies that if A is the first player to move, she starts by proposing x^* which is immediately accepted. Likewise for player B .

[Step 3] Step 1 and 2 imply that every SPE shares the same acceptance and passing condition. Consider first the acceptance condition. If B rejects an offer in $\mathcal{G}'_A$ we go to $\mathcal{G}'_B$ where, by what observed before, he gets y^*_B . But $y^*_B = \delta x^*_B$ so every proposal giving him in $\mathcal{G}'_A$ at least x^*_B should be accepted, otherwise rejected. Putting everything together we have that player B must accept any proposal giving him exactly x^*_B . Similar reasoning for the passing condition and for player A . ■

One important consequence of the theorem is that every subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profile, consisting of stationary acceptance strategies, of a two-player PNG with valuable time and with $N = \{A, B\}$ starting from $\mathcal{G}$ and with A (resp. B) first player to move induces a play h of length 4 and of value for player A of x_A^* while for player B of δy_B^* (resp. $(y_A^*, \delta x_B^*)$ if B moves first).

To summarize, when time is valuable and players' value of time (impatience) is measured by a vector of discount factors δ and no withdrawals and opting out are allowed, the SPEs following stationary acceptance strategies are essentially unique, efficient and redistribute a maximal payoff vector in a *fair* way, depending on players' impatience, viz. in each SPE play, players agree as soon as possible and divide (almost) evenly any of the maximal outcomes in the game. Thus, introducing value of time solves both problems of efficiency and fairness at once.

5.2.2 Opting out allowed

When we allow players to opt out the SPE strategy profiles substantially change. Therefore, in every SPE the player moving first can always ensure an equilibrium payoff of at least his expected value in the initial NFG, which can in particular be strictly higher than his payoff in x^* . However the following can be claimed:

Proposition 12 *In every SPE strategy profile of a PNG with valuable time starting from a NFG $\mathcal{G}$ that is perfectly solvable every SPE attains the payoff vector $(\mathbf{v}_A(\mathcal{G}), \mathbf{v}_B(\mathcal{G}))$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to notice that in case the starting NFG is perfectly solvable we have that for every player i , $m_i(\mathcal{G}_i) = M_i(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathbf{v}_i(\mathcal{G})$, as the possibility of opting out by either player is always a profitable deviation from strategies attaining different payoff vectors. ■

As a consequence of the claim, if a PNG starts from an optimally solved NFG then either the first player opts out immediately or he proposes the original distribution $(\mathbf{v}_A(\mathcal{G}), \mathbf{v}_B(\mathcal{G}))$ that is accepted by the second player, who can alternatively opt out.

Proposition 13 *In every subgame perfect equilibrium strategy profile consisting of stationary acceptance strategies of a PNG with valuable time starting from a NFG $\mathcal{G}$ that is uniformly solvable but not optimally solvable and where opting out is possible, both players receive strictly more than their expected value in $\mathcal{G}$.*

Proof.

First we should notice that for every $\mathcal{G}'$ and $i \in N$, $m_i(\mathcal{G}'_i) \geq \mathbf{v}_i(\mathcal{G}')$. As we know that the game is uniformly solvable but not optimally solvable, we have that $\mathbf{v}_i(\mathcal{G}) < b_i^i - \mathbf{v}_{-i}(\mathcal{G})$. But then player i should accept some agreement giving him strictly more than $\mathbf{v}_i(\mathcal{G})$. The result follows from the fact that acceptance strategies are stationary. ■

If a PNG starts with a game that is uniformly solvable but not optimally solvable (i.e. there is space for improvement), the player moving first can improve on the expected outcome of the initial game only on the condition to ensure to her opponent at least his expected value in the initial game.

5.2.3 Withdrawals allowed

When withdrawals of offers are possible the situation is more complicated, as withdrawing is dependent on the past history and some techniques used in the proofs of the previous

results does not readily carry over. We leave this case for future investigation, but only note that in the case where withdrawals of offers are allowed, every play of a PNG with valuable time consisting of withdrawals can be replaced by one without withdrawals leading to the same outcome and giving both players strictly higher payoff. Furthermore, if only stationary acceptance strategies are considered, then withdrawals are never part of SPE strategy profiles.

6 Related work

The present study has a rich pre-history, related to earlier work on bargaining [Rub82, OR90] and various pre-play negotiation procedures [Gut78, Gut87, Ros75, Kal81, Far98, Var94a] (see for a broad discussion [GT]). Here we only mention the most relevant recent work. To our knowledge, Jackson and Wilkie [JW05] are the first to have studied arbitrary transfers from a player to a player in a normal form game. Their framework shares a number of common points with ours, as it studies a two-stage transformation on a normal form game where players announce transfers of payments between each other on the initial normal form game and then play the updated game. Yet, there are fundamental differences with our framework. In [JW05]:

(i) transfers from a player A to a player B are of the form (in our notation) $A \xrightarrow{\delta/\sigma} B$ where $\sigma \in \prod_{i \in N} \Sigma_i$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\delta = 0$ whenever $A = B$, i.e. players make positive side payments to other players *conditional on the entire outcome of the game*, and not only on the recipient's individual strategy, as in our framework; technically, every unconditional offer from player A to player B can be simulated by a set of such transfers from A to B . This is, however, not the case for conditional offers, which would instead require a *set* of transfers from B to A as well, or the possibility for δ to be negative, i.e. the introduction of punishments.

(ii) players announce their transfer offers *simultaneously*. Cancelling an offer by another player is technically possible in such framework, by simply making payments at every outcome which cancel out, e.g. $A \xrightarrow{\delta/\sigma} B$ and $B \xrightarrow{\delta/\sigma} A$, but cannot be a deliberate response to an anticipated action.

(iii) the authors study strategies that can be *supported*, i.e. that they are subgame perfect equilibria of the two-stage game and Nash-equilibria *of the original game* that also *survive* — i.e. remain equilibria — in the updated game. In particular they focus on the (interesting) relation between the solo-payoff, i.e. the Nash equilibrium payoff that a player can guarantee by making offers, and the supportability of strategies. For the sake of precision, the solo-payoff u_i^s , starting from a normal form game $\mathcal{G}$ where mix strategies are allowed, is defined as $\sup_{t_i} (\min_{\mu \in NE(t_{-i}^0, t_i)} EU_i(\mu, t_{-i}^0, t_i))$, where:

- $\mu \in NE(t_{-i}^0, t_i)$ denotes the set of Nash equilibria of the second stage game (the one updating $\mathcal{G}$ with players' simultaneous offer) when player i offers t and the other players offer nothing;
- $EU_i(\mu, t_{-i}^0, t_i)$ the expected utility for player i associated to the profile μ, t_{-i}^0, t_i (as specified above);
- $\sup$ and $\min$ simply return the expected values;

Jackson and Wilkie show two important results for the two-player case, the main bulk of their paper: (i) that every Nash equilibrium x of the starting game survives if and only if it yields for every player i a utility that is higher than the one given by i 's solo-payoff; and

(ii) that a transfer function together with an outcome are supportable if and only if they yield for every player i a utility that is higher than the one given by i 's *minimal* solo-payoff, the solo-payoff obtained by making *minimal* offers. It is worth noticing that the definition of minimal offer resembles the one we have adopted here: the minimal transfer function needed to change the game solution.

(iv) the role of time is not considered and players cannot build upon the game obtained in the second stage, by for instance subsequently making further offers.

The main result of [JW05] consists of showing that side-payments cannot guarantee efficiency, i.e. there are games in which strategies leading to the choice of Pareto optimal outcomes in the second-stage game are not supported.

Ellingsen and Paltseva [EP11] generalize [JW05] in several ways:

- Transfers from a player A to a player B are again of the form $A \xrightarrow{\delta/\sigma} B$ where $\sigma \in \prod_{i \in N} \Sigma_i$, but now $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta = 0$ whenever $A = B$, i.e. players are allowed to propose both rewards and punishments contingent upon entire strategy profiles. This boils down to players not only making offers but also proposing contracts, left for the other players to sign or reject.
- The game played is composed of three stages: (i) the one in which players propose contracts, (ii) the one in which players decide whether to sign a contract, (iii) the one in which players play the game updated by the signed contract.
- Contracts are proposed on mix strategies, and non-deterministic contracts are considered, i.e. it is possible to make randomize offers.

In a nutshell, while in [JW05] each player A specifies the nonnegative transfer to the other players for each pure strategy profile σ , in [EP11] each player specifies a (possibly negative) transfer to the other players for each (possibly mixed) strategy profile σ and, at the same time, specifies a signing decision for each contract of the other players. Ellingsen and Paltseva show that their more general contracting game always has efficient equilibria. In particular they show that all the efficient outcomes guaranteeing to each player at least as much as the worst Nash-equilibrium payoff in the original game can be attained in some equilibrium.

The message conveyed by this stream of contributions is that efficiency can be reached if the structure of players' offers is complex enough. On the one hand Jackson and Wilkie show that promises are not enough to attain efficient outcomes, while Ellingsen and Paltseva show that contracting is. Besides analyzing preplay interaction as a proper bargaining game, we also focus on the effects that additional factors in the preplay negotiation game, such as valuable time, withdrawals, and opting out have on attaining outcomes that display desirable properties, such as efficiency and fairness. Moreover we also discuss how equilibrium strategies themselves display desirable properties, i.e., being efficient negotiation strategies.

7 Conclusion

We have analyzed the role and effect of conditional offers in preplay negotiation games under various assumptions concerning players' rationality, perception of time, possibility of revoking previous commitments and opting out from the negotiations. We have shown that when time is of no value efficiency can be attained, provided some coherence in players' behaviour is assumed (Proposition 6). Yet, there are cases in which inefficiency can be reached in

equilibrium outcomes (comment to Proposition 6). When time is not valuable, the outcomes reached in the PNG can be extremely unfair, even if efficient (Proposition 8). However, when time is valuable, under some natural assumptions players reach efficient and relatively fair outcomes (Theorem 11). The latter result draws an explicit connection between our preplay negotiation games and bargaining games studied in [OR94].

Some issues remain still open in this study, in particular the possibility of ruling out the existence of non-stationary acceptance strategies and withdrawals of previously made offers in all SPE profiles of PNGs with valuable time. As for the potential future developments, the framework can be extended in various ways, as also discussed in [GT]. In particular, we have shown there that when players can only make *unconditional* offers, not contingent on matching supplementing offers by the recipients, the analysis of the preplay negotiations phase changes radically and in a way becomes even more interesting. Its full analysis is the subject of an ongoing work. Lastly, the analysis of preplay negotiation phase in games with three and more players is substantially more complicated and is one of the main future challenges in this research.

References

- [aMT06] Dov Monderer and Moshe Tennenholtz. Strong mediated equilibrium. 2006. in: Proc. of AAAI 2006.
- [DS91] Leif Danziger and Adi Schnytzer. Implementing the Lindahl voluntary-exchange mechanism. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 7:55–64, 1991.
- [EP11] Tore Ellingsen and Elena Paltseva. Non-cooperative contracting. Submitted, <http://www2.hhs.se/personal/ellingsen/pdf/Non-cooperativeContracting5.pdf>, 2011.
- [Far98] Joseph Farrell. Communication, coordination and nash equilibrium. *Economics Letters*, 27:209–214, 1998.
- [GT] Valentin Goranko and Paolo Turrini. Preplay negotiations in non-cooperative games. Under submission, 2012. Available from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.1718>.
- [Gut78] Joel M. Guttman. Understanding collective action: Matching behavior. *American Economic Review*, 68(2):251–255, 1978.
- [Gut87] Joel M. Guttman. A non-Cournot model of voluntary collective action. *Economica*, 54(213):1–, 1987.
- [JW05] Matthew O. Jackson and Simon Wilkie. Endogenous games and mechanisms: Side payments among players. *Review of Economic Studies*, 72(2):543–566, 2005.
- [Kal81] Ehud Kalai. Preplay negotiations and the prisoner’s dilemma. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 1:375–379, 1981.
- [OR90] Martin Osborne and Ariel Rubinstein. *Bargaining and Markets*. Academic Press, 1990.
- [OR94] Martin Osborne and Ariel Rubinstein. *A course in game theory*. MIT Press, 1994.
- [Ros75] Robert W. Rosenthal. Induced outcomes in cooperative normal-form games. *Review of Economic Studies*, 975. Discussion Paper No. 178, Center for. Math. Studies, Northwestern University.

- [Rub82] A. Rubinstein. Perfect equilibrium in a bargaining model. *Econometrica*, 50:97–110, 1982.
- [Var94a] Hal R. Varian. Sequential contributions to public goods. *Journal of Public Economic*, 53:165–186, 1994.
- [Var94b] Hal R. Varian. A solution to the problem of externalities when agents are well-informed. *American Economic Review*, 84(5):1278–93, 1994.